

CAN HISTORIOGRAPHY BE FREE FROM BIAS, PREJUDICE AND PARTIALITY?

K. V. Ramakrishna Rao

INTRODUCTION

The word *Historiography* connotes the writing of history or the art of writing history, thus, the intervention of human interests, drives, urges and aspirations, which are definitely dependent upon internal and external factors of dealing persons and their personalities. The art of history writing instead of dealing with the facts and actual happenings has been drifted to the art of interpretations because of philosophical, logical and epistemological methods employed. Thus, such interpretations have been invariably ideological leading to divergent explanations and expositions. Just like the classical blind men trying to figure out the elephant by touching, the historiographers have been trying to picture history according to their conceptions, perceptions, hypotheses and theories. Of course, the elephant of the story was patiently standing withstanding the caressing, cuddling and snuggling of the blind men, but the elephant of history definitely would not tolerate the different and differing strokes of historians and historiographers.

* As day-by-day data and information of different aspects of humanity are reaching to people, the connected, affected and interested people start questioning the history that shows contradictions in actual life with past and historical processes that lead to different consequences and results in the present. Theoreticians, ideologists and converted historians cannot take readers and people for granted as they can too question their hypotheses, theories and conclusions. It is after all people who decide what they want in the society, nation and world according to changing times. Therefore, historiography has to be objective – fair, impartial, unbiased, unprejudiced, dispassionate and thus based on the facts.

CAN HISTORIOGRAPHY BE LIBERATED FROM SEMANTICS?

Modern day historiography has become more of playing with words, word-jugglery and semanticism / Semasiology. This is because the scholars always try to project their own viewpoint to dominate over others. Thus more interpretation, argument and debate for the sake lead to pleonastic, tautological and verbose historiography instead of precision, accuracy, completeness and brevity. Ideology, personal bias, prejudice and preconceived notions play havoc in such willful and wishful deliberations, proceedings and exercises. In the pursuit of such methodology, unfortunately, the historiographers and historians are becoming theoreticians and ideologists in propagating views of historiography by interpreting present on the past.

Historicism, historiosophy, historicity and such other expressions are used with definitions. However, the list increases day-by-day as the histotigraphical studies increase. Just by using adjective *historical* attached to other words and expressions, they may try to create new phrases, but they should be specific.

exact and proving with material evidences. We note there have been so many expressions formed like this and an able person can define these terms with astuteness of subject and language skill.

| | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Historical knowledge | Historical epistemology | Historical interest |
| Historical consciousness | Historical knowing | Historical reality |
| Historical truth | Historical cognition | Historical description |
| Historical fact | Historical process | Historical law |
| Historical understanding | Historical statement | Historical event |
| Historical chronology | Historical plan | Historical agenda |
| Historical fact | Historical truism | Historical existence |
| Historical tradition | Historical culture | Historical heritage |
| Historical civilization | Historical simile | Historical explanation |
| Historical interpretation | Historical belief | Historical euphemism |
| Historical inference | Historical assumption | Historical presumption |
| Historical premises | Historical substantiation | Historical justification |
| Historical validation | Historical discipline | Historical test |

But people want facts and not interpretations. They are not interested in what so and so would not do like this or that, but, they want that they should not repeat the same affecting their life. The historians can preach that no historical wrongs can be corrected by another wrong, but why such historical wrongs occurred, why the involved should have committed such wrongs, how they were prepared to commit, what inspired to do so etc., should be explained by the preachers. Negationism, that too historical negationism cannot qualify to guarantee that the wrongdoers do not repeat the historical process based on the theory of historical cycle or otherwise. If anybody tries to formulate, codify and prescribe certain historical discipline, they expect others also to follow the same. They know that there could not be historical exceptions, exemptions and privileges. They know very well that facts are simple but interpretations are complex. To call spade a spade nothing is required. Therefore, to free from such verbose, historians should resort to scientific methodology. The scientific method of narrating or recording events involves careful observation, inference and conclusion.

SCIENTIFIC METHODOLOGY IN HISTORY AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

It is not simply using scientific terminology like synthesis, analysis, dynamics, statics, construction, production, demonstration, etc in adjective and noun forms in interpretations. Scientific methodology involves the following clear cut and systematic features:

1. Orderly, observable, verifiable, controlled, objective, tangible and recordable processes.
2. Technical, methodical, logical, precise and exact observation, inference and conclusion.
3. Wherever material evidences are available, they are to be checked, analyzed and found out the details about them.
4. Their origin, how they could have come out, what implements could have been used, whether such technology was available, if so where the inputs could have been procured – like this, all facts should be gathered.
5. The data from the material evidences should be compared, collaborated and corroborated with other available evidences.
6. If literary evidences alone are available about information instead of data, they could be verified with natural phenomenon.

7. Thus, all processes could be fixed in time and place with data collected and conversion of data by processing into meaningful information.
8. Formation of laws to codify such processes and conclusions.
9. Easy application of such laws.
10. Application of such laws at any time and place to get the same results.
11. Getting such results by any person.
12. If any observation, inference, conclusion or law does not answer any happening or process, then such data has to be kept in abeyance and used for future, the moment any new evidence comes up.
13. In scientific methodology, there is no useful or useless data as all data are meaningful giving information, when data is processed systematically.

Therefore, in history writing and historiography, if any methodology is adapted and adopted and claimed as scientific, they should have these features to satisfy the historical processes, happenings and results.

OBSERVATION AND RECORDING OF CONTEMPORARY EVENTS

There have been many official recording and rendition of contemporary events of war and other campaigns undertaken by the rulers, where engaged writers, scribes and poets used to prepare chronicles. But, invariably, they are mixed with imaginary, superlative, superstitious description, as they are done with an intention to please the masters.

However, how a contemporary event could be recorded can be formulated as follows:

1. Observation involves psychosomatic factors of the observer and that of environment.
2. If the observer were lack of any psychosomatic factors, there would be improper observation in his inspection and examination. So also the factors of environment, as they have to be understood completely by the observer depend upon the connected factors.
3. Even if he has perfect psychosomatic conditions, if he is prone to or has decided to be influenced or affected by external factors, his observation would not be objective.
4. With objective observation, after making inspection and research, he should make inference.
5. The inferences could be taking all factors of cause and effect, probabilities and possibilities into account. Mainly material evidences decide feasibility, workability and plausibility of inference.
6. Then with all observed, inspected and recorded happenings corroborated by circumstantial evidences, wherever necessary or required, conclusion can be drawn.
7. The conclusion should be specific and up to the point. No ambiguous words should be used leading to interpretation.
8. It should be actual and factual of data and information. Instead of deciding or thrusting his / her opinion on others, he should stop with reporting and recording.
9. Interpretation with or without elucidation, exposition, rendition, redacting, may lead to different versions.
10. No data should be suppressed or withheld, whether they are useful or useless, favourable or unfavourable to the observer.

After this, the observed data, information and results should be published and made available to all within easy access.

RECORDING AND DECIDING OF PAST EVENTS

Unlike contemporary events, the past events could only be perceived, conceived, visualized and reenacted by the writers with probabilities and possibilities. Therefore, the responsibility of such writers has been more than that of recorders of contemporary events. So, how they could be objective without any bias and what are their expectations in recording and writings can be listed as follows:

1. Past events, happenings and incidences have to be taken from the past records only.
2. Such records could be primary or secondary.
3. First the authenticity and reliability of the records should be established and decided before using for research.
4. The concept that only written records are historical and others are *ahistorical* (not historical) cannot be conclusive methodology, as unwritten material evidences tell more history than the written ones, particularly, the material evidences of science and technology have great impact on the historiography than the historical records.
5. Discrimination should be made clearly between edited and unedited texts and scriptures, when reliance is made heavily on them.
6. The writer should or should have read the texts and scriptures before writing. He cannot quote from others or cite favourable lines for his viewpoint and interpretation.
7. If alternative and other possible happening could have been possible, he should record it without suppressing such evidence.
8. He cannot reflect present on the past events. As one can know the unknown only from the known, he cannot take privilege of interpreting past with the experience of the present.

WHAT IS HISTORY?

The word history, based on different dictionary meanings and authorities, simply connotes—

1. Continuous methodical record of public events.
2. The succession of events, situations and processes in the preceding development of society.
3. The description and reflection of such sequence.
4. Study of growth of nations.
5. Whole train of events connected with nation, person or thing.
6. An analogous sequence in some individual sphere of activity.
7. Eventful past career.
8. The development of a certain sequence of phenomenon in nature.

Therefore, it is evident that history is not only the sequential chronological order of events but also the factors behind leading to such events. It is equated with archives, annals, chronicles, accounts, reports, memoirs and records. Thus, initially, it covered the ambit of narrative events mainly political and then started covering other aspects of society and social processes. The chronological aspect was linked thereafter.

The word history is derived from Greek and Latin *historia* meaning inquiry, thus *histor* denotes a learned man. Later, it was attributed to investigation and research. The Greco-Latin word *historio* is distinguished from the German word *Geschichte*, which connotes *which occurred or happened*. This resembles *Itihasa*, which has the same meaning. Not only 17th and 18th century historians used the word *Geschichte* to define collections of historical materials, but also the 19th century historians too used to mean the narration of events as well as mere collections of facts.

In the stricter sense, the features of history can be specifically listed as follows:

1. History is not what has been written or being written but it is actually what had happened in the past.
2. History is not a narrative, description or report of what had happened in the past, as none in the present saw or knew the past.
3. If any account, memoir or chronicle of the past is available, then, it can be taken for study to gauge the past with other contemporary, circumstantial, material evidences.
4. In history, none could claim that his / her account is alone truth or absolute truth, as everybody knows that his account is not complete but subject to change whenever any new evidence is come out or reported.
5. Every historian should develop a tendency of hearing the other the best of principle of judiciary – *audi alteram partem*—no one should be condemned without unheard i.e, the other view should be respected, read and subjected to criticism and should not condemned without reading or hearing to their viewpoint. Thus, they should not come to any decided, exclusivist or forceful conclusions to thrust them on the readers.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF HISTORICAL EVENTS

A critical analysis of historical events may cover the following factors:

1. The happening may be a phenomenon, occurrence, manifestation, incident, episode, and event.
2. Such happening has to be factual—actually happened, and subjected to reality and authentic verification.
3. The historical happening is a happening—phenomenon, occurrence, incident, episode and manifestation clearly. It cannot be viewed in the past, visualized in the present and interpreted in future differently, as it happened within historical time and place.
4. The authentic verification covers the facts of actuality, certainty, reality, verity, certitude and truism.
5. Reality covers fact and truth and also lead to physical existence, object, and actuality, thus testing authenticity of materiality, substantiality and validity.
6. Though accuracy, precision, exactness, definitiveness cannot be achieved in the narration, writing and recording the events, definitely, certainty, certitude and assurance are required to attain the status of historicity.
7. Narration of event may be contemporary or of later period. As there would be difference in the contemporary description itself, the variation in the later period is evident, patent and imminent.
8. Such variance is attributed to human factors, which are identified as human likes and dislikes later turning into ideology at one level and professional bias at the other level.
9. The cause and effect, action and reaction principles clearly expose the factuality of historical happening.
10. Thus, available material evidences help for critical analysis. Therefore, they should be analyzed scientifically in all aspects. Here, inter-disciplinary study is important, as historians have limited knowledge.

THE QUESTION OF PROGRESS, ADVANCEMENT, DEVELOPMENT, GROWTH, EVOLUTION ETC

In historical processes of humankind, particularly situated at different places could and should not be equated or measured with the same yardstick. The determination of Progress, Advancement, Development,

Growth, Evolution etc is not possible with precision, as such factors and conditions are relative. Moreover, the mental Progress, Advancement, Development, Growth, Evolution etc has been much more importance than the physical ones related to material ones. Materially progressed, advanced, developed, grown and evolved situation, condition and position are useless or redundant, when there is no corresponding mental factors. Therefore, historians and historiographers should be very careful in assessing, determining and deciding about any group, society and nation.

Thus, the man's progress from teeth to stone, stone to wood and wood to metal, metal to machine progress cannot take place exactly as proposed, imagined or studied by archaeologists at all parts of the world by all peoples. The disparagement of a civilization with highly refined language, literature, philosophy, science and technological achievements without script cannot be considered pre-historic, barbaric, uncivilized and so on.

CHRONOLOGY AND DATINGS

Chronology is the study of time i.e, after studying time, it turns out to be a science of computing dates and thus, in history and historiography, it is nothing but a methodology of dating the events and happenings. As historiography gained importance so also chronology and datings of events are. While chronology is both abstract in 19th century and concrete to some extent later, datings are based on modern scientific methods. Dating of material evidences gives specific dates and period and thus fixing the events. The chronology is related to period, epoch, age, era, eon, cycle and so on depending upon the time reckoning, recording and preservation. Chronology of a country should be determined only in the respective time and place and cannot be fixed or equated with others. When two factual events are to be tested for contemporaneity, word jugglery or philology should not be a deciding factor, but all other factors. If one literature, society or group claims anything about another literature, society or group, it could be cross-checked easily. If the other literature, society or group does not mention, naturally the claim has to be subjected to critical scrutiny for arriving at any conclusion. Many times historians and historiographers make generalizations, which could be avoided as listed below:

1. When natural catastrophes happen, it would affect all people at all places in the same manner.
2. All men should have originated in the middle-east or Mediterranean area and spread to other areas leading to other cultures and civilizations.
3. All human beings should follow the sequential stone and metal ages to get civilized, progressed and advanced.
4. Without writing or written documents, there is no history or historical period.
5. The conflict of divine origin and theory of evolution should not be used in historiography changing stands.
6. Unscientific racial, racially casteist, fanatically linguistic, fundamentally religious, communally secular and such other attitudes can have no place in historiography.
7. There are nations, which are always invaded by others. Therefore, dominant group or nation has a right to invade such nation and colonize.
8. The humanity in the divine plan, is divided into two domains and they are termed differently in different dominant domains—hellene x barbarian, civilized x uncivilized, momin x kafir, jew x gentile, christian x heathen, believer x non-believer; proletariat x bourgeois, west x east, developed x undeveloped and so on. Thus, the former groups have a sanctioned duty to civilize the later groups.
9. History is history of class struggle in any society. Whatever may be the background of the society, it is splitting into two great hostile camps—the bourgeois and the proletariat. The class struggle is complete with revolution.

This type of mindset always works in such a way to disparage the tradition, heritage and civilization of others; tries to reduce their chronology; suppress their advancement of science and technology or impose the borrowal theory to confuse the facts and so on.

HISTORICAL HYPOTHESES AND THEORIES WITH OR WITHOUT MATERIAL EVIDENCES AND THAT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY IN HISTORY

With the above scientific methodology, historical hypotheses and theories with or without material evidences can be compared with material evidences of science and technology. As the arguments, interpretations and debates have been more on the Indus Valley Civilization (mentioned as IVC) and Harappan culture, examples are taken from them for comparison as follows.

HISTORICAL HYPOTHESES AND THEORIES WITH OR WITHOUT MATERIAL EVIDENCES MATERIAL EVIDENCES ANALYZED IN THE LIGHT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY IN HISTORY

Would be abstract, conceptual and intangible. Would be concrete, real and tangible.

Iron was not there in India, till the invading Aryans in 2000 BCE introduced it. When sculptures of north India datable to 3000 BCE (IVC dancing girl made of Copper, torso of a man of red sandstone), 1000 BCE (Lomarishi cave) etc prove the high-level Iron technology as without which the processes of chiselling, cutting, carving, melting, casting etc., could not have been there.

Indians had no sense of history (Elphinstone, Max Mueller, Mill and others). Indians had their own sense of history writing that is not appreciated, through the vast literature available (3500 BCE).

Indians had no sense of chronology. Indians had high precision of time reckoning and recording through asterism, lunar and solar movements since Vedic period (3500 BCE).

Early India wrote no history because it never made any (A. A. McDonnell). India had the highest philosophy, logic and epistemology since 3500 BCE. Then, how is that they could have had such intellect, reasoning and cognition without history.

India has no history before Alexander's invasion (Vincent Arthur Smith). India has many material evidences before Alexander. In fact, India never recognized Alexander, as he is no event in Indian history. Greeks and Alexander's apologetic historians should find out as to why Indians did not care Alexander.

India has no proper history before Mohammedan invasion in 13th century (James Fergusson). This is biased as proven by the previous allegation.

India had no writing. No written record to the past and therefore, the ancient period is pre-historic i.e. not historic.

Writing required only when man wants to reduce his knowledge to writing. None can assert that without writing man cannot speak, converse, and compose poems and so on. How the ancient Vedic literature could have come out in pre-historic period? Or why the historic man could not produce literature like pre-historic Vedic man?

IVC has script, but it is still undeciphered and therefore, it is proto-historic. Undecipherment of script proves the inefficiency of man and not that of the man who wrote. Moreover, modern ignorance of 2000 CE cannot disprove the material evidence and knowledge of 3500 BCE.

There was no horse in IVC before 2000 BCE. If there was horse, it was not domesticated. If it is domesticated, it was not used for war. If it is used for war, Aryans did not use it.

The material evidence of 3500 BCE proves the existence of horse. Available technology determines the usage of metal and therefore girdles. Thus, the horse riding.

Domesticated horse was there in Bagor and Rajasthan around 4500 BCE. However, the lists of animals from Bagor appearing in standard texts (reports) do not mention horse.

The material evidence available is that of domesticated horse of 4500 BCE in Bagor i.e. more ancient than the demarcated period of 2000 BCE. Horse is not depicted on the IVC seal.

Already, it has been accepted that the material evidence of 3500 BCE proves the existence of horse. Therefore, it is irrelevant that horse is not depicted on the seals. Instead, it is evident that no seal depicting horse on it is recovered so far.

Iron was not there in IVC before 2000 BCE and in South India before 1500 BCE.

The Copper technology, stone carvings, standard bricks, weights and measures of IVC clearly prove the existence of Iron technology.

Horse drawn chariots could not have been used / seen by the Rig-Vedic composers or listeners. When horse was there, technology there, usage there, depiction there in literature, why then the composers or listeners should not have used or seen them?

Fire altars of IVC are looked upon with suspicion.

The material evidence of Fire altars of IVC is not denied. Cremation was prevalent from pre-Vedic period is debatable.

That the Dravidians or the Tamils of the Sangam period used the practice is not denied.

The *mature Harappan culture* is based between 2500 and 1700 BCE, while *Vedic people* appear after i.e. 1000 BCE. Therefore, even *later Vedic Aryans* could not have created Harappan culture. It is well known that the date of Vedas varies and not fixed to 1000 BCE. If *later Vedic Aryans* could not have created, then, could it be by *former Vedic Aryans*?

The Harappan script might be *proto-Dravidian* or *non-Indo-European*.

If the script holders of the Harappan culture were *proto-Dravidian* during 2500-1700 BCE, why the *true-Dravidians* of mature culture of *Sangam literature* did not have any script? Why should they have a *Brahmi script*?

IDEOLOGY, HISTORIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

Ideology is a set of beliefs, doctrines, convictions, tenets, opinions and ideas later turning into established dogma and philosophy supported with their own ethical, moral and logical code. Ideology coupled with political, religious, social, racial, linguistic, casteist, bureaucratic, administrative and other affiliations, motives and personal aggrandizement lead to demerit historiography, as the writers are prepared to write according to the dictum of the rulers and bosses and get benefits. Such pre-conceived, pre-determined and pre-planned historiography has become a role model for ideologist-historians, historiographers and history writers.

Thus, when ideologist becomes a historian or historiographer, his writings cannot be impartial, unbiased, unprejudiced and non-partisan. Ideologist many times plays multiples roles of theorist, theorizer, hypothesizer, speculator, and conjecturer. Tentative assumptions, presumptions, educated guesses, professional conjectures mar the subject matter. Historian or historiographer cannot accuse of others of anything when he himself has decided to behave like the one of whom, he is complaining. He cannot theorize the behaviour and writing of others, and turn red when others start to proceed in the same line.

1. A historian becomes a *fascist*, the moment he dominantly asserts and argue that his view alone is correct and others incorrect, therefore all should accept his view.
2. Becomes a *fundamentalist*, if he believes that one religious scripture alone is infallible, none could

ask any questions about one particular religious scripture, one scripture is history another scripture is myth and so on.

3. Becomes a *fanatic*, when he claims that his dictum of one faith, creed, language, culture, tradition, heritage alone is correct and that of others incorrect.
4. A *communalist*, when he argues the case of one or other community against any other or a particular community.
5. An *Obscurantist*, when he supports obscurantism of one group and always opposes that of other group.

And the other often used expression-pairs are—progressive reactionary, liberal conservative, revolutionary revivalist, democratic fascist, socialist capitalist, secular communal. In fact, these are the words used against other scholars who differ from their views.

WHY HISTORIOGRAPHY SHOULD BE SUBJECTED TO BIAS, PREJUDICE AND PARTIALITY?

It is because of involvement of ideology, which is closely linked to the personal benefits accrued to the holders of such ideology. Historiographers are human beings. When they choose to write history and they themselves or the employers decide that the writing should arrive at a particular result, then, anybody can understand that motivated, vested interests start playing in the history writing thus turning into biased historiography. The personal enrichments and comforts are related to psychosomatic factors and thus, the same psychosomatic factors act in historiography with bias, prejudice and partiality. That is why to camouflage their ugly intentions, they theorize new propositions, propose hypotheses and theories to justify their Pre-conceived, pre-determined and pre-planned historiography. Thus, ideology dictates methodology to be adapted and adopted in their historiography. Thus, we see the following contradictions:

1. Theorizing, talking and writing against caste of one particular religion, society or nation and forgetting or not even whispering about the existence of such social discrimination and differentiation existing in other religions, societies and nations with different names such as class, creed, denomination, and so on, thus promoting casteism.
2. Condemning communalism, fundamentalism, and fanaticism, of one group and turning blind eye to that of other groups.
3. If he could not differentiate the historical processes in the light of violence and non-violence or justifies the violent groups against non-violent groups, definitely he is making mistake.
4. Material evidences of all groups should be taken into consideration in interpreting processes.

PRE-CONCEIVED, PRE-DETERMINED AND PRE-PLANNED HISTORIOGRAPHY

Historiography could neither be a speculative nor indefinite subject, as it is an attempt towards perfection made on the path of certainty. Therefore, with fixed results or conclusions, historiographers cannot proceed. If they are ordered to do so, what can be avoided are listed below:

1. Selective, choosy, discriminative writings to drive out their point of view only.
2. Publicity, propaganda, indoctrination, harsh persuasion, "only what we say is correct" - attitude etc would be hallmark of such methodology.
3. Print and electronic media give wide publicity to one viewpoint and play down or even black out the other viewpoint.
4. Over-glorification and repeated usage of certain evidences and suppression of other evidences which are not favourable and suitable to their interpretation and ideology.

5. Results are kept before writing to arrive at such results.
6. In fact, unless such results are arrived at, they are not honoured or paid for the work.
7. Attacking the other historians and writers, if they are not supporting their view or holding opposite views according to them.
8. If intellectually, they cannot be countered or argued, they resort to personal attacks of mudslinging, defaming and belittling.

EVEN PROFESSIONAL BIAS IS DANGEROUS IN HISTORIOGRAPHY

Bias, as seen before, is the attitude of a person formed, because of his pre-conceived, pre-determined and pre-formed opinion, prejudice and conviction towards a particular issue.

Professional bias is such bias formed during working in a characteristic manner thereby suppressing the unfavorable evidences and giving over emphasis for the favorable evidences or presenting such evidences alone the true ones against others.

As discrimination is always aided and abetted with other factors like bigotry, intolerance, chauvinism, parochialism, and partiality with the ingrained qualities of jealousy, hostility and hatred, it affects intellectuality, wisdom and knowledge. Holding one particular view, hidden affiliation, implied leaning etc always aim at awards, rewards, aids, grants, postings and so on.

When such intellectualism is supported by the wishful and motivated ideologues, theoreticians and colleagues, it turns into intellectual arrogance. Then, it fails to appreciate, respect or even understand the views expressed, facts presented and findings of the others.

A historiographer, historian and history writer may be great, reputed and standard, but if he / she has professional bias, his writings would have skillful manipulations, adroit stratagem, sophisticated arguments and so on, then his / her writings would be biased. Instead of presenting the facts, he / she may try to suppress the facts and present argumentative fictions as facts. Such forceful debaters, dominant arguers, sophisticated writers, ideological advocates, and of such categories cannot become good, honest and sincere historiographers. They would reach a status that they could prove or disprove anything and everything just because of their forceful language used, arguments put forward and publicity given to such strategic methodology.

Therefore, here professional ethics could only save honest historiography.

CONCLUSION

If historiography has to be free from bias, prejudice and partiality, the involved should remember the following points.

1. He should be impartial, neutral, just, independent, objective, open-minded in analyzing events, corroborating evidences, scrutinizing the records and other substantiations.
2. He should have equanimity and serenity of mind, and will over control of his emotions, sentiments and sensations and also that of others.
3. He should avoid all personal prejudices – love or hatred for anything, euologization / glorification or disparagement of any person, place or thing.
4. Just like a poet, who renders poems flowing from his heart, immediately on seeing a scene, the historian or historiographer should write spontaneously.
5. Sitting in a comfortable place with all supporting materials, writing a poem is equivalent to stage-managed history. Such history writers are not historians.

6. He should not have any instructions, compulsions and obligations to arrive at a particular result or conclude so and so to suit the masters, rulers or others, who have engaged them for the purpose.
7. Even the aids, grants, postings, awards, rewards, honorary positions and fellowships, nominations, affiliations etc., should not colour his working and writings.
8. If any interference is noted, bossism practiced or the programme, plan, scheme or project to be carried out at the wish of somebody, organization or party, then, honest historian or historiography should disassociate with them or resign from the scheme or project immediately.
9. Rejection, suppression, negationism, manipulation or destruction of evidences is not a characteristic of historiography.

Notes and References

1. H. J. Eysenck (1953), *Uses and Abuses of Psychology*, Pelican, London.
2. Victor G. Panov (1985), *Emotions, Myths and Theories*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
3. V. A. Lektorsky (1984), *Subject Object Cognition*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
4. Institute of Social Sciences (1985), *Social Psychology and Propaganda*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
5. Anatoly Rakitov (1987), *Historical Knowledge*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
6. D. P. Gorsky (1981), *Definition*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
7. I. Frolov (1984), *Dictotianary of Philosophy*, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
8. Joseph MacCabe (1985), *History's Greatest Liars*, Austin, Texas.
9. Oscar Handlin (1979), *Truth in History*, The Belkuap Press, London. In the preface itself, under the title, *The Abuses of History*, the writer notes as follows:

"The 1970s added an economic dimension to the plaintive apologetics. Since most historians earned their livelihood by teaching, they suffered during that unhappy decade when education abruptly became a buyer's market. Persuaded of the need to choose relevance, students shopped avidly for the best bargains in learning; and in many institutions the study of history suffered. To protect their jobs, historians like other faculty members, set about demonstrating the utility of the subject matter they purveyed", p.vii.
10. D. K. Ganguly (1984), *History and Historians in Ancient India*, Abhinav, New Delhi.
11. C. H. Philips (Ed) (1961), *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, London.
12. Eric Hobsbawm (1985), *Introduction: Inventing Tradition in The Invention of Tradition*, Eric Hobsnawm and T. Ranger (Ed), Cambridge, 1985.